



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,781	07/20/2005	Walter Dorr	49090	9232
1609	7590	11/21/2009	EXAMINER	
ROYLANCE, ABRAMS, BERDO & GOODMAN, L.L.P. 1300 19TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON,, DC 20036			LOPEZ, FRANK D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3745	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte WALTER DORR

Application 10/542,781
Technology Center 3700

Mailed: November 23, 2009

Before *JOYCE GUNTER-RILEY, Review Paralegal.*

GUNTER-RILEY, Review Paralegal

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on November 16, 2009. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter(s) requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER, HEADINGS

A review of the file indicates that the Examiner's Answer filed July 07, 2009 does not comply with the guidelines provided in MPEP § 1207.02 because it does not contain all of the required heading items. Specifically, the Examiner's Answer must contain the following heading items in the following order:

(11) *Related Proceedings Appendix..*

An in-depth review of the Examiner's Answer indicates that the following sections are missing from the Examiner's Answer mailed July 07, 2009 and/or are not complete or clear in setting forth agreement or disagreement with the Appeal Brief:

11) "Related Proceedings Appendix",

A substitute Examiner's Answer that is in compliance with the guidelines is required. *See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 1207.02 (8th ed. Rev. 6, Sept 2007)* for details.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is hereby
ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner for further consideration.

- 1) to vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed July 07, 2009;
- 2) to generate a new Examiner's Answer in compliance with the guidelines; and
- 3) for such further action as may be required.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797

/jgr/

ROYLANCE, ABRAMS, BERDO & GOODMAN, L.L.P.
1300 19TH STREET, N.W.
SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, DC 20036